

(2) Mr. Juan Rodriguez (Attorney of Record).

Date of Interview: 13 January 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No. If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: proposed amendments.

Identification of prior art discussed: Loveland and McClendon.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. a) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative requested the interview to present amendments to the claims to remove ambiguity and clearly define the intelligent CAD object and to state the object arrangement is not necessarily hierarchical as presented in the cited prior art. Applicant's comments and amendments will be taken into consideration once filled.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS TROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Neveen Abel-Jalil/	
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2165	
C Detect and Trademati Office	